

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 14, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-10 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claim 11 has been added. No new matter has been added, and no new issues are raised which require further consideration and/or search. Claims 1-11 are submitted for consideration.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 on the grounds that the claimed invention lacks utility. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that claims 1 and 6 do not clearly point out what or how the "function sets" are used. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Therefore, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,483,585 to Parker in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,784,786 to Sumner. According to the Office Action, Parker discloses all of the elements of claims 1-10 except for disclosing that each single default record is common to a plurality of default subscribers whose subscriber functions correspond to the subscriber functions in the default record concerned. Therefore, the Office Action combined Parker and Sumner to yield all of the elements of claims 1-10. The rejection is traversed as being based on references that neither teach nor

suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 1 and 6, and any claims dependent therefrom, in addition to newly added claim 11.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-5 depend, recites a method including defining one or more default function sets, each default function set including one or more subscriber functions of a digital telephone exchange defined as default functions and partitioning subscribers of the digital telephone exchange into default subscribers and special subscribers. The default subscribers are those subscribers whose subscriber functions correspond to one of the default function sets and the special subscribers are those subscribers whose subscriber functions do not correspond to any of the default function sets. The method also includes storing subscriber functions consistent with the default function sets in default data records of a subscriber database, each single default data record being common to a plurality of default subscribers whose subscriber functions correspond to the subscriber functions in the default data record concerned and storing subscriber functions for each special subscriber in subscriber-specific data records of the subscriber database, each subscriber-specific data record being specific to the special subscriber concerned. The method further includes reading the subscriber functions for each default subscriber of the plurality of default subscribers from the default data record concerned and reading the subscriber functions for each special subscriber from the subscriber-specific data record for the subscriber concerned. The method also includes managing subscriber functions in the telecommunications network by using subscriber functions read from the default data record and from the subscriber-specific data record.

Claim 6, upon which claims 7-10 depend, recites a system including one or more default data records in which subscriber functions consistent with default function sets are stored and from which the subscriber functions for default subscribers are read, each single default data record being common to a plurality of default subscribers whose subscriber functions correspond to the subscriber function in the default data record concerned and one or more subscriber-specific data records in which the subscriber functions for each special subscriber are stored and from which they are read. The system also includes a managing unit configured to manage subscriber functions of subscribers in a telecommunications network with the one or more subscriber-specific records and the one or more default records.

As will be discussed below, the cited prior art reference of Parker fails to disclose or suggest the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

As mentioned in Applicant's previous Response, Parker teaches a telecommunications system that includes a local exchange or switch, an element manager for the exchange and a configuration manager for the element manager. Col. 2, lines 50-53. The element manager and the configuration manager operate in what is known as an object-oriented environment. Col. 3, lines 23-25. The object class of the element manager includes a CUSTOMER-PROFILE, a DIRECTORY-NUMBER, an ACCESS-PORT, CUSTOMIZED RESOURCES, CALL-FORWARDING, THREE PARTY AND CALL WAITING. Each instance of the CUSTOMER-PROFILE represents the data of a particular customer or subscriber of the exchange. Col. 3, line 59- Col. 4, line 10. When it is desired to

configure the element manager so as to provide a new customer with basic telephone services, or provide an existing customer with a supplementary service, or remove a supplementary service or basic telephony services from an existing customer, instances of various object classes used in the element manager are created or modified as appropriate. Col. 5, lines 2-30. For each existing customer, an instance of the customer profile object is stored in an object store 31. Col. 5, lines 21-26. After receiving a request for data on a specified customer, the instance of the CUSTOMER-PROFILE object is retrieved from the object store 31 for the specified customer. The instance includes the data on the customer which is then displayed. Col. 6, lines 15-30. If a user wishes to create a new customer, the user enters the information associated with the customer and a new instance of the CUSTOMER-PROFILE object is created. Col. 6, lines 31-39.

Sumner discloses subscriber-customized group messages in a selective call messaging system. To allow this, a master message (i.e. a non-customized message) is delivered to those subscribers not requiring customization. A corresponding records message 326 is delivered to those subscribers requiring customization. The records message 326 comprises a message field 514 called "record" comprising subscriber-customized information. See Col. 1 lines 41-52, Col. 6 lines 30-32, Col. 6 lines 43-50 and Fig. 5 of Sumner.

Applicant respectfully submits that Parker and Sumner fail to teach or suggest the elements of each of the presently pending claims. Claim 1, in part, recites storing subscriber functions consistent with the default function sets in default data records, each single default data record being common to a plurality of default subscribers whose

subscriber functions correspond to the subscriber functions in the default data record concerned and reading the subscriber functions for each default subscriber of the plurality of default subscribers from the default data record concerned. Claim 6, in part, recites one or more default data records, in which subscriber functions consistent with default function sets are stored and from which the subscriber functions for default subscribers are read, each single default data record being common to a plurality of default subscribers whose subscriber functions correspond to the subscriber functions in the default data record concerned. The Office Action acknowledge that Parker fails to teach or suggest that each single default record is common to a plurality of default subscribers whose subscriber functions correspond to the subscriber functions in the default record concerned, as recited in claims 1 and 6. However, the Office Action alleged that Sumner teaches this element.

As noted above, Sumner discloses that the records message 326 comprises a message field 514 called "record" including subscriber-customized information. As is obvious to one skilled in the art, the "record" message of Sumner bears no relation to the present invention. As discussed in the previous Response, the term "record" in the present invention refers to a single information element of a database rather than to a complete database or data store. A record does not refer to a message field, as disclosed in Sumner. The present invention recites the feature of how to decrease the amount of records used in a subscriber database for default subscribers. Neither Parker nor Sumner teaches or suggest a single default data record of a subscriber database being common to

a plurality of default subscribers, as recited in the present invention. More, particularly, Sumner fails to teach or suggest **any** data record of a subscriber data base. Rather, Sumner merely discloses a message field that happens to be labeled as a “record.”

Furthermore, Col. 1, lines 19-23 and Col. 5, lines 45-54 of Sumner discloses that the “record” message field 514 delivers customization information for information service group messages, such as weather reports, sports information, and news. Parker, on the other hand, discloses a data store 31 storing configuration data on basic telephony services and supplementary telephony services, such as call forwarding, call waiting and three party calls. See at least the Abstract, Col. 4, lines 53-67 and Col. 6, lines 4-54 of Parker. Therefore, given that Sumner relates to information services while Parker relates to telephony services, there is no motivation for a person of average skill in the art to combine the teachings of Parker with those of Sumner. Yet, even if they were combined, the result would be something like an arrangement to deliver e.g. weather reports to a subscriber that also has e.g. a three party call telephony service activated. The combined references would not teach or suggest e.g. how to configure the three party call telephony service of Parker with the group messages of Sumner. More particularly, the combined references would not teach or suggest a single default data record of a subscriber data base being common to a plurality of default subscribers, as recited in the presently pending claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Parker nor Sumner, whether taken singly or combined teaches or suggests each feature of claims 1 and 6 and hence, dependent claim 2-5 and 7-10 thereon.

As noted previously, claims 1-11 recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art references cited in the Office Action. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-11 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Arlene P. Neal
Registration No. 43,828

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

APN:kmp